

1
2
3
4
5
6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**
8

9 THOMAS R. LORD,)

10 Petitioner,)

3:98-cv-00574-LRH-VPC

11 vs.)

ORDER

12 E.K. McDANIEL, *et al.*,)

13 Respondents.)
14 _____/

15 Before the Court is petitioner's Third Unopposed Motion for Enlargement of Time in Which
16 to File an Opposition to the Respondents' Motion to Dismiss and Answer (docket #110). Petitioner
17 then filed a response to the motion to dismiss and answer (docket #111). The Court finds that
18 petitioner's motion for enlargement of time was made in good faith and not solely for the purpose of
19 delay. The Court will grant the motion and treat the response as timely filed.

20 Respondents have filed a Motion for Enlargement of Time to file a Reply to Petitioner's
21 Opposition (docket #112). The Court finds good cause for the extension of time, and will grant the
22 motion.

23 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that petitioner's Motion for Enlargement of Time (docket
24 #110) is **GRANTED**. The response is treated as timely filed.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that respondents' Motion for Enlargement of Time (docket
2 #112) is **GRANTED**. Respondents shall have up to and including July 2, 2008, in which to file a
3 reply to petitioner's opposition.

4 DATED this 18th day of June, 2008.



LARRY R. HICKS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE